UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/815,251	03/30/2004	Satyajit Nath	2222.5500000	8159
STERNE, KESSLER, GOLDSTEIN & FOX P.L.L.C. 1100 NEW YORK AVENUE, N.W. WASHINGTON, DC 20005			EXAMINER	
			KIM, JUNG W	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2432	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			02/07/2011	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

## Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)
10/815,251	NATH, SATYAJIT
Examiner	Art Unit
JUNG KIM	2432

The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on	the cover sheet with the correspondence address
THE REPLY FILED <u>26 January 2011</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICA	ATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the sam application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with	ne day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request
no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY	the final rejection. ction, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In
MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f). Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension a under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than thre may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL	nd the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as we months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed,
<ol> <li>The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in compliance w filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension the Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the AMENDMENTS</li> </ol>	ereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior  (a) They raise new issues that would require further considerati  (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);  (c) They are not deemed to place the application in better form	on and/or search (see NOTE below);
appeal; and/or (d) They present additional claims without canceling a correspondence NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).  4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See	
<ul> <li>5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):</li> <li>6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allowable non-allowable claim(s).</li> </ul>	
7.  For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) will r how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided be The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: 1-12 and 29-45. Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: 13-28.	
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE	all the course beautiful to the course of th
<ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficie was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).</li> </ol>	nt reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and wa	e <u>all</u> rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a
10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	·
11. The request for reconsideration has been considered but does N See Continuation Sheet.	
12. Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i> (s). (PTO/SE 13. Other:	3/U8) Paper No(s)
	/Jung Kim/
	Primary Examiner, AU 2432

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant's arguments are directed to distinctions defined in the proposed claim amendment, which are new issues that would require further search and consideration. The proposed amendments are not entered.

With respect to applicant's argument that Merriam does not teach the proposed new limitation "cryptographically associating, by encrypting at least a portion of the electronic document using a cryptographic key, the document retention policy with the electronic document" (Remarks, pg. 19-20), this argument is not persuasive because Merriam discloses encrypting the information set using the encryption keys, and moreover, Merriam discloses that the document retention policy (i.e. policies for deleting stored, encrypted information sets) is implemented by retaining/deleting the encryption/decryption keys, which suggests the limitation "cryptographically associating ... the document retention policy with the electronic document."

With respect to applicant's arguments that the prior art does not disclose the "that the cryptographic key is protected by a document access policy" (Remarks, pgs. 21-22) this argument is not persuasive. Although the proposed amendment further distinguishes that the access policy comprise access rules to provide restrictive access to the cryptographic key and the electronic document, this argument is not persuasive because the claim scope is still defined broadly such that the access rules restricts access to keys and documents as a group. This feature is suggested by Merriam in view of Pensak. Pensak et al. clearly disclose policies that restrict access to encrypted documents. These policies further restrict access to the corresponding decryption keys for their counterpart encrypted documents. I.e. only if a user is authorized to access an encrypted document, is the user authorized to access the corresponding decryption key for the encrypted document.

With respect to applicant's traversal of the Official notice (Remarks, pg. 23-24), applicant does not provide any rationale why the supported notice is inadequate. Mere conclusionary remarks are insufficient to overcome the rejection..